arXiv:1410.6417v1 [math.CV] 23 Oct 2014

Random conformal welding for finitely connected regions

Shi-Yi Lan*and Wang Zhou†

Guangxi University for Nationalities, and National University of Singapore

Abstract. Given a finitely connected region Ω of the Riemann sphere whose complement consists of m mutually disjoint closed disks $\bar{U}_j$, the random homeomorphism h_j on the boundary component ∂U_j is constructed using the exponential Gaussian free field. The existence and uniqueness of random conformal welding of Ω with h_j is established by investigating a non-uniformly elliptic Betrami equation with a random complex dilatation. This generalizes the result of Astala, Jones, Kupiainen and Saksman to multiply connected domains.

Keywords: Random welding; quasiconformal mapping; Gaussian free field; SLE.

MSC(2010): 30C62, 60D05.

1 Introduction

Over the last decades there has been great interest in conformally invariant fractals which could arise as scaling limits of discrete random processes in the complex plane or the Riemann sphere. One of the most important examples of confromally invariant fractals is the Schramm Loewner Evolution (SLE) introduced by Schramm [20] in 2000. There are several different versions of SLE, among which chordal SLE and radial SLE are the most well-known. A chordal SLE trace describes a random curve evolving in the upper plane from one point on the boundary to another point on the boundary. A radial SLE trace describes a random curve evolving in the disk from a point on the boundary to an interior point. The behavior of the SLE trace depends on a real parameter $\kappa > 0$. If $\kappa \in (0, 4]$, the trace is a simple curve; if $\kappa \in (4, 8)$, the trace has self-intersections; and if $\kappa \in [8, \infty)$, the trace is space-filling. For more information on SLE_κ and related topics, see [11, 19] and [10] etc..

Moreover, many two-dimensional random lattice paths from statistical physics have been proved to have SLE_κ curves as their scaling limits when the mesh of the grid tends to 0, such as

*Shi-Yi Lan was partially supported by the NSF of China (11161004) and NSF of Guangxi (2013GXNSFAA019015). E-mail address: shiyilan05@sina.com

†Wang Zhou was partially supported by a grant R-155-000-151-112 at the National University of Singapore. E-mail address: stazw@nus.edu.sg

the critical site percolation exploration path [25, 26, 5], loop erased random walks and uniform spanning tree Peano paths [12], the harmonic explorers path [21], the chordal contour lines of the discrete Gaussian free field [22], the interfaces of the FK Ising model [27].

Besides conformal invariance, the SLE paths evolve in the domain. In other words, the SLE paths are indexed by capacity or natural parametrization [13, 14]. However there are other conformally invariant curves which are independent of an auxiliary time. Recenly, Astala, Jones, Kupiainen and Saksman [2] used the idea of conformal welding to construct a random family of closed conformally invariant curves in the Riemann sphere based on a method of Lehto [15, 1] and a result [9] on the conformal removability of Hölder curves. This family of random curves obtained in [2] is stationary for each inverse temperature less than a certain critical value. Instead of the white noise representation for the Gaussian free field, in a similar manner Tecu [28] extended the work of Astala, Jones, Kupiainen and Saksman [2] to the situation of criticality using a vaguelet representation of the Gaussian free field. In the meantime, we also note that Sheffield [24] investigated a conformal welding of two Liouville quantum gravity random surfaces using a totally different approach. Two quantum surfaces of normalized quantum area are welded together by matching quantum length on the boundaries. This results in an SLE interface.

However, these results mentioned above deal with random conformal weldings only for simply connected domains. In this paper we are concerned with the random conformal welding associated with finitely connected domains. Fix a positive integer $m \geq 2$, suppose that Ω is an m-connected region of the Riemann sphere $\mathbb{S}^2 = \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ whose complement $\mathbb{S}^2 \backslash \Omega$ is a union of m disjoint closed disks $\bar{U}_j, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. Our main goal is to establish the existence and uniqueness theorem for the random conformal welding of Ω, which will yield m mutually disjoint random Jordan curves on $\mathbb{S}^2$. Our method involves modifications and generalizations of those in [2]. We first construct random measures by limiting processes via the exponential Gauss free fields restricted to the boundary components ∂U_j of Ω, which allow us to define random homeomorphisms ψ_j on ∂U_j. Next we will solve the conformal welding problem of Ω with ψ_j, i.e., to seek a random conformal mapping f from Ω into $\mathbb{S}^2$ and random conformal mapping g_j from U_j into $\mathbb{S}^2$ such that $g_j(\zeta) = f \circ \psi_j(\zeta)$ when $\zeta \in \partial U_j, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, and the images $\Gamma_j = f \circ \psi_j(\partial U_j) = g_j(\partial U_j)$ are the desired random Jordan curves.

To this end, applying the technique of Beurling-Ahlfors extension [3] we extend the random homeomorphisms $\psi_j : \partial U_j \to \partial U_j$ to Ω, which leads to a quasiconformal homeomorphism of $\mathbb{S}^2$ with a random complex dilatation λ. Thus the welding problem is reduced to solving a non-uniformly elliptic Beltrami equation with λ. We prove the existence and uniqueness of the solution to the Beltrami equation using the techniques of Lehto [15, 1], and the conformal removability for boundary components of multiply connected domain. Hence we get the existence and uniqueness of random conformal welding associated with Ω, which generalizes the result of [2] to finitely connected domains. Our main result can be summarized as follows.

With probability one, there exist random conformal mappings $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{S}^2$ *and* $g_j : U_j \to \mathbb{S}^2$, *respectively, such that their boundary values satisfy* $g_j(\zeta) = f \circ \psi_j(\zeta)$ *when* $\zeta \in \partial U_j, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, *which produce* m *mutually disjoint random Jordan curves* $\Gamma_j = f \circ \psi_j(\partial U_j) = g_j(\partial U_j)$. *Moreover, almost surely in* ω, *these Jordan curves* Γ_j *are unique up to a Möbius transformation* $\chi = \chi_\omega$ *of the Riemann sphere* $\mathbb{S}^2$.

We refer to Theorem 2 in Section 5 for a complete statement involving Gaussian free fields.

Although our result is a generalization of [2, 28], there is a big difference between our paper and [2, 28], which can be summarized by the following three points.

1. The random conformal welding for simply connected regions is discussed in [2, 28], which generates a random Jordan curve in $\mathbb{C}$. Instead, we here deal with the random conformal welding associated with the finitely connected domain Ω, which leads to m mutually disjoint random Jordan curves in $\mathbb{S}^2$.

2. The construction of the extension mapping in [2, 28] involves only one random homeomorphism, while the corresponding extension mapping in this paper is produced by m random homeomorphisms. We also apply the fact that these random homeomorphisms are invariant under conformal transformations of $\mathbb{S}^2$.

3. The unique solution to the Beltrami equation in [2, 28] is determined by the conformal removability of a Hölder Jordan curve, whereas the uniqueness of the corresponding solution in the present paper is obtained by showing that the m boundary components of the multiply connected domain are conformally removable. To achieve this we appeal to a result of [17, 6], i.e., a conformal mapping from a finitely connected domain can be expressed as a composition of finitely many conformal mappings of simply connected domains.

In addition, it is worth to point out that the deterministic version of conformal welding for the finitely connected region Ω has been discussed by Marshall [17] using the geodesic zipper algorithm and Koebe's iterative method to compute conformal mappings. In a sense the current paper may be viewed as a random version of [17].

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we shall briefly introduce the definitions of conformal welding and Gaussian free field, and state some useful results. In Section 3 we construct random homeomorphisms on the boundary components $\partial \bar{U}_j$ of the multiply connected domain Ω by means of the exponential Gaussian free field. In Section 4 we show that there exists a solution to the non-uniformly elliptic Beltrami equation with a random complex dilatation λ. Moreover, this solution is unique up to Möbius transformations of $\mathbb{S}^2$. In Section 5 we establish random conformal welding theorems for the multiply connected domain Ω, which generates m random conformal welding curves Γ_j on the Riemann sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$.

2 Conformal weldings and Gaussian free field

In this section, we will briefly review some basic concepts related to conformal welding and Gaussian free field, and provide some useful results; see [16, 8, 18, 4, 1, 23, 22] for more details.

2.1 Conformal weldings

Consider the Riemann sphere $\mathbb{S}^2 = \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$. The conformal welding arises usually in the following two cases.

The first case is the **conformal welding of simple connected domains.** Given two disjoint Jordan domains Ω_1 and Ω_2 in $\mathbb{S}^2$ and a homeomorphism $\psi : \partial\Omega_2 \to \partial\Omega_1$, one can attach Ω_1 and Ω_2 by identifying points ζ of $\partial\Omega_2$ with points $\psi(\zeta)$ of $\partial\Omega_1$. The mapping ψ is called a welding homeomorphism if there exist conformal mappings f and g of Ω_1 and Ω_2, respectively, onto complementary regions of $\mathbb{S}^2$ such that

$$g(\zeta) = f \circ \psi(\zeta) \tag{1}$$

for each $\zeta \in \partial\Omega_2$. If ψ is a welding homeomorphism, then it induces a conformal welding. Since the two regions push and pull against one another as they find their new positions, this yields a Jordan curve Γ known as the conformal welding curve.

Conversely, if we are given a homeomorphism ψ which maps $\partial\Omega_2$ onto $\partial\Omega_1$, the conformal welding problem is to seek a conformal welding curve Γ and conformal mappings $f : \Omega_1 \to \Omega_1^*$ and $g : \Omega_2 \to \Omega_2^*$ such that their boundary values satisfy (1), where $\Omega_1^* \cup \Gamma \cup \Omega_2^* = \mathbb{S}^2$. The Conformal Welding Theorem [16, 7, 8] tells us that if Ω_1 and Ω_2 are both disks and ψ is a quasi-symmetric mapping, then a conformal welding will exist and the conformal welding curve will be a quasicircle.

Remark 1 *Williams [29] constructed discrete conformal weldings of the first case which converge uniformly on compact subsets to their continuous counterparts. The corresponding random conformal weldings were investigated by Astala, Jones, Kupiainen and Saksman [2], which produces a conformally invariant random family of closed curves in* $\mathbb{S}^2$. *Tecu [28] extended the result of [2] to the situation of criticality.*

The second case is the **conformal welding of finitely connected regions.** Fix a natural number $m \geq 2$, and suppose we are given m disjoint simply connected domains $\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \ldots, \Omega_m$ on $\mathbb{S}^2$, which are bounded by disjoint Jordan curves. The Riemann mapping Theorem and Koebe's Theorem imply that there exist conformal mappings g_j of disks U_j onto Ω_j and a conformal mapping f of $\mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \cup_{j=1}^m \bar{U}_j$ onto $\mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \cup_{j=1}^m \bar{\Omega}_j$. We call the mappings $\psi_j = f^{-1} \circ g_j : \partial U_j \to \partial U_j$ the welding homeomorphisms associated with the multiply connected domain $\mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \cup_{j=1}^m \bar{U}_j$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$.



Figure 1. A conformal welding exists for ψ_j if there are conformal mappings f and g_j onto complementary regions of $\mathbb{S}^2$ whose boundary values satisfy $g_j = f \circ \psi_j$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$.

On the other hand, consider an m-connected region $\Omega = \mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \cup_{j=1}^m \bar{U}_j$. If we are given m homeomorphisms $\psi_j : \partial U_j \to \partial U_j$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, then the conformal welding problem for Ω and U_j is to find a conformal mapping f from Ω into $\mathbb{S}^2$ and conformal mapping g_j from U_j into $\mathbb{S}^2$ such that

$$g_j(\zeta) = f \circ \psi_j(\zeta) \tag{2}$$

for all $\zeta \in \partial U_j, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. Consequently, this will lead to a sphere with patches Ω_j, bounded by Jordan curves $L_j = f(\partial U_j) = g_j(\partial U_j)$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$; see Figure 1.

Remark 2 *The numerical implementation of the second case, where U_j are all equal to the unit disk for $j = 1, 2 \ldots, m$, was discussed by Marshall [17] using the geodesic zipper algorithm and Koebe's iterative method to compute conformal mappings. In the present paper our aim is to establish a random version of conformal welding theorem for the second case, which results in m mutually disjoint random Jordan curves in $\mathbb{S}^2$.*

2.2 Gaussian free field

The two-dimensional Gaussian free field (GFF) is a two-dimensional-time analog of Brownian motion, which may be viewed as a Gaussian random variable on an infinite dimensional space.

Definition 1 *For a given planar domain $D \subset \mathbb{S}^2 = \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ let $H_s(D)$ be the space of C^∞ real-valued functions with compact support in D, and let $H(D)$ be its Hilbert space completion under the Dirichlet inner product*

$$(f_1, f_2)_\nabla := (2\pi)^{-1} \int_D \nabla f_1(z) \cdot \nabla f_2(z) dz,$$

where dz refers to area measure. We define an instance h of the Gaussian free field (GFF) to be the formal sum

$$h = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \alpha_j f_j, \tag{3}$$

where the α_j are i.i.d. one-dimensional standard (unit variance, zero mean) Gaussian random variables, and $\{f_j, j = 1, 2, \cdots\}$ is any orthonormal base of $H(D)$.

The sum (3) does not converge within $H(D)$ almost surely, since $\sum |\alpha_j|^2$ is infinite almost surely. However, it does converge almost surely in the space of distributions on D. That is, the limit $(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \alpha_j f_j, g)$ almost surely exists for all $g \in H_s(D)$, and the limit value as a function of g is almost surely continuous on $H_s(D)$. For each $f \in H(D)$, $(h, f)_\nabla$ is a mean zero Gaussian random variable, and

$$\mathrm{Cov}((h, f_1)_\nabla, (h, f_2)_\nabla) = (f_1, f_2)_\nabla \tag{4}$$

for any $f_1, f_2 \in H(D)$. The collection of random variables $(h, f)_\nabla$ for $f \in H(D)$ is thus a Hilbert space with the inner product (4).

Conformal invariance. Let ϕ be a conformal mapping from D to another planar domain $\tilde{D}$. Then an elementary change of variables calculation gives that

$$\int_{\tilde{D}} \nabla(f_1 \circ \phi^{-1}) \cdot \nabla(f_2 \circ \phi^{-1}) dw = \int_D (\nabla f_1 \cdot \nabla f_2) dz$$

for any $f_1, f_2 \in H_s(D)$. Taking the completion to $H(D)$, we see that the Dirichlet inner product is invariant under conformal transformations of D. This implies that the two-dimensional GFF possesses the conformal invariance property.

Representation of covariance. For a fixed $\zeta \in D$, let $\tilde{G}_\zeta(z)$ be the harmonic extension to $z \in D$ of the function of z on ∂D given by $-\log|z - \zeta|$. Then Green's function in the domain D is defined by

$$G(\zeta, z) = -\log|z - \zeta| - \tilde{G}_\zeta(z).$$

It is known that if $\zeta \in D$ is fixed, then Green's function $G(\zeta, z)$ may be viewed as a distributional solution of the Poisson equation $\Delta G(\zeta, \cdot) = -2\pi\delta_\zeta(\cdot)$ with zero boundary conditions.

For each $g \in H_s(D)$, we define a function $\Delta^{-1} g$ on D by

$$\Delta^{-1} g(\cdot) := -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_D G(\cdot, z) g(z) dz.$$

Then $\Delta^{-1} g(\cdot)$ is a C^∞ function in D whose Laplacian is g. If $f_1 = -\Delta^{-1} g_1$ and $f_2 = -\Delta^{-1} g_2$, then integration by parts gives that

$$(f_1, f_2)_\nabla = \frac{1}{2\pi}(g_1, -\Delta^{-1} g_2),$$

where $(\cdot,\cdot)$ denotes the standard inner product in $L^2(D)$. Note that each $h \in H(D)$ is naturally a distribution, since one may define the map $(h,\cdot)$ by $(h,g) := 2\pi(h,-\Delta^{-1}g)_\nabla$ for any $g \in H_s(D)$. It is easy to see that $-\Delta^{-1}g \in H(D)$. Thus, if $-\Delta f = g$, then we may write $(h,g) = 2\pi(h,f)_\nabla$. This implies

$$\mathrm{Cov}((h,g_1),(h,g_2)) = (2\pi)^2(f_1,f_2)_\nabla.$$

Hence, it follows that

$$\mathrm{Cov}((h,g_1),(h,g_2)) = \int_{D\times D} g_1(\zeta)G(\zeta,z)g_2(z)d\zeta dz.$$

So $G(\zeta,z)$ is also the integral kernel of covariance $\mathrm{Cov}((h,f_1),(h,f_2))_\nabla$ for any $f_1,f_2 \in H(D)$.

Notice that in this paper we consider only the restriction of the Gaussian free field (3) to the boundary components ∂U_j, $j = 1,\cdots,m$, of the multiply connected region Ω.

3 The construction of random homeomorphisms

In this section we will describe how to construct random homeomorphisms on the boundary components of the finitely connected domain Ω in $\mathbb{S}^2$. First, the restriction of Gaussian free field (3) ($D = \mathbb{C}$) to each boundary component of Ω may be given by a concrete expression, and the latter can be further expressed in terms of a white noise representation. Next we use the white noise representations of (3) to construct random measures on the boundary components of Ω, which can be viewed as martingale limits of products of exponentials of independent Gaussian fields. Thus we may define random homeomorphisms on the boundary components of Ω and derive some useful results. In particular, we show that these random homeomorphisms are conformally invariant. This generalizes the random homeomorphism of the unit circle constructed in [2] to the case of m mutually disjoint circles with finite radii in $\mathbb{C}$.

3.1 The representations of GFF on boundary components

As before, let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{S}^2$ be an m-connected domain whose complement is a union of disjoint closed disks $\bar{U}_j, j = 1,2,\ldots,m$, for any fixed integer $m \geq 2$, and assume that ∞ belongs to U_m. For convenience, we will work on the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$ instead of the Riemann sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$, keeping in mind that ∞ corresponds to one point on $\mathbb{S}^2$. This implies that $U_j, j = 1,2,\ldots,m-1$, are bounded, and that U_m are unbounded in $\mathbb{C}$ where ∞ may be viewed as a point in U_m. Thus we may write $U_j = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z-a_j| < r_j\}$ where $|a_j| < \infty, 0 < r_j < \infty$ for $j = 1,2,\ldots,m-1$, and assume that the exterior of U_m is equal to the disk $U_m^c = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z-a_m| < r_m\}$ where $|a_m| < \infty, 0 < r_m < \infty$. Hence Ω can be written as $\Omega = U_m^c \setminus \cup_{j=1}^{m-1} \bar{U}_j$.

We first give the concrete representations of traces of GFF on the boundary components ∂U_j of Ω. Set $h_j = h|_{\partial U_j}, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, which may be viewed as the restriction of the 2-dimensional GFF on $\mathbb{C}$ to ∂U_j. The covariance functions of h_j, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, have the integral kernels

$$G_{h_j}(\zeta, \zeta') = -\log|\zeta - \zeta'|, \quad \zeta, \zeta' \in \partial U_j \tag{5}$$

If we let $\zeta = a_j + r_j e^{i2\pi t}, \zeta' = a_j + r_j e^{i2\pi t'}, t, t' \in [0, 1)$, where a_j and r_j are the centers and the radii of $U_j, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m-1$, respectively, and a_m and r_m are the center and the radius of U_m^c respectively, then it follows from (5) that the covariance functions of h_j, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, may take the forms

$$G_{h_j}(t, t') = -\log 2r_j \sin\pi|t - t'|, \ t, t' \in [0, 1) \tag{6}$$

when ∂U_j is identified with $[0, 1)$. A direct computation gives that the fields h_j, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, with covariances (6) can be expressed by the Fourier expansions

$$h_j = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{r_j^n}{\sqrt{n}}(\alpha_n^{(j)} \cos 2\pi nt + \beta_n^{(j)} \sin 2\pi nt), t \in [0, 1) \tag{7}$$

where $\alpha_n^{(j)}, \beta_n^{(j)} \sim N(0, 1), n \geq 1$ are independent standard Gaussian random variables. We remark that if ∂U_j are all equal to the unit circle for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, i.e., $a_j = 0, r_j = 1$, then (6) and (7) will become the resutls discussed in [2].

Next, we will describe further that the formula (7) can be expressed by white noise representations. A white noise Y in the upper half-plane $\mathbb{H}$ is a centered Gaussian process, indexed by sets with finite hyperbolic area measure in $\mathbb{H}$, whose covariance structure is given by the hyperbolic area measure of the intersection of sets. We will need a periodic version of Y, which can be identified with a white noise on $[0, 1) \times \mathbb{R}_+$. To be more specific, set

$$W = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{H} : -\frac{1}{2} < x < \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } y > \frac{2}{\pi} \tan|\pi x|\}$$

and

$$V = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{H} : -\frac{1}{4} < x < \frac{1}{4} \text{ and } 2|x| < y < \frac{1}{2}\}.$$

For a small positive number $\epsilon > 0$, we define two random fields $Y^\epsilon(x)$ and $Z^\epsilon(x)$ by

$$Y^\epsilon(x) := Y(x + W_\epsilon), \ x \in [0, 1) \tag{8}$$

where $W_\epsilon = \{(x, y) \in W : y > \epsilon\}$, and

$$Z^\epsilon(x) := Y(x + V_\epsilon), \ x \in [0, 1) \tag{9}$$

where $V_\epsilon = \{(x, y) \in V : y > \epsilon\}$, respectively. Then the covariance functions of two fields $Y_\epsilon(x)$ and $Z_\epsilon(x)$ can be expressed by

$$\mathbb{E}(Y^\epsilon(x_1)Y^\epsilon(x_2)) = \mu((x_1 + W_\epsilon) \cap \bigcup_{z \in \mathbb{Z}} (x_2 + W_\epsilon + n)) \tag{10}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}(Z^\epsilon(x_1)Z^\epsilon(x_2)) = \mu((x_1+V_\epsilon)\cap\bigcup_{z\in\mathbb{Z}}(x_2+V_\epsilon+n)) \tag{11}$$

respectively, where μ denotes the hyperbolic area measure in $\mathbb{H}$, given by $\mu(dxdy) = dxdy/y^2$. Then we have the following lemma, which formulates that the restriction of h to ∂U_j can be represented by the white noise.

Lemma 1 *(i). For each $h_j = h|_{\partial U_j}, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, there exists a version $Y_j^\epsilon(x)$ of the white noise (8) which converges weakly to a random field Y_j as $\epsilon \to 0$ satisfying $Y_j \sim h_j + G_j$, where $G_j \sim N(0, 2r_j \log 2)$ is a scalar Gaussian factor, independent of h_j, and r_j denotes the radius of circle ∂U_j.*

(ii). There exists a version $Z_j^\epsilon(x)$ of the white noise (9) corresponding to $Y_j^\epsilon(x)$ such that

$$w_j := \sup_{x\in[0,1),\epsilon\in(0,1/2]} |Z_j^\epsilon(x) - Y_j^\epsilon(x)| < \infty \quad a.\ s..$$

Moreover, $\mathbb{E}e^{qw_j} < \infty$ for any $q > 0$.

Proof. Since the Gaussian free field h on $\mathbb{C}$ is conformally invariant, the distribution of $h_j = h|_{\partial U_j}$ is identified with one of $h|_{\partial\mathbb{U}}$ for each ∂U_j, where $\partial\mathbb{U}$ denotes the unit circle. Thus similar to the proof of [2, Lemma 3.4], according to Duldey's theorem we may conclude (i). A straightforward computation through (10) replacing Y^ϵ and W^ϵ by Y_j and W, respectively, combined with (6), gives that Y_j has the same distribution as $h_j + G_j$. Note that each Y_j^ϵ has the same law as $Y^\epsilon(x)$, while $Y^\epsilon(x)$ is equivalent to $H_\epsilon(x)$ in [2]. Therefore in the light of (10) and (11), following the proof of [2, Lemma 3.5] we can conclude that (ii) holds. □

3.2 The homeomorphisms from random measures

The stationarity of $Y_j^\epsilon(x)$ in Lemma 1(i) implies that $\mathrm{Var}(Y_j^\epsilon(x))$ is independent of $x \in [0, 1)$, where $\mathrm{Var}(Y_j^\epsilon(x)) = \mathbb{E}|Y_j^\epsilon(x)|^2$. Assume that $\beta_j > 0, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, and let $M([0, 1))$ denote the set of bounded Borel measures on $[0, 1)$. For any $x \in [0, 1)$ and each $g \in M([0, 1))$, consider the following processes

$$X_j^\epsilon := e^{\beta_j Y_j^\epsilon(x) - \beta_j^2 \mathrm{Var}(Y_j^\epsilon(x))/2}$$

and

$$\hat{X}_j^\epsilon := \int_0^1 e^{\beta_j Y_j^\epsilon(x) - \beta_j^2 \mathrm{Var}(Y_j^\epsilon(x))/2} g(x)dx.$$

It is easy to see that X_j^ϵ and $\hat{X}_j^\epsilon$ are L^1-martingales with respect to decreasing $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2]$. The martingale convergence theorem gives that X_j^ϵ and $\hat{X}_j^\epsilon$ converge almost surely as $\epsilon \to 0$, and that their L^1-norms stay bounded. This, combined with Lemma 1(i), gives rise to random measures τ_j on $[0, 1)$, which can be defined by

$$\tau_j(dx) := \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} e^{\beta_j Y_j^\epsilon(x) - \beta_j^2 \mathrm{Var}(Y_j^\epsilon(x))/2} e^{-\beta_j G_j} \frac{dx}{2^{r_j\beta_j^2}} \quad \mathrm{w}^* \quad \text{in} \quad M([0, 1)) \quad \text{a. s.}, \tag{12}$$

where $G_j \sim N(0, 2r_j \log 2)$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, are Gaussian random variables. The limit measures τ_j, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, are weak*-measurable in the sense that the integrals $\int_0^1 g(x)\tau_j(dx)$ are well-defined random variables for all $g \in C([0, 1))$.

In addition, with the same reason as above we may define the random measure ν_j on $[0, 1)$ corresponding to $Z_j^\epsilon(x)$ in Lemma 1(ii) by

$$\nu_j(dx) := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} e^{\beta_j Z_j^\epsilon(x) - \beta_j^2 \mathrm{Var}(Z_j^\epsilon(x))/2} dx \quad \text{w}^* \quad \text{in} \quad M([0, 1)) \quad \text{a. s.}, \tag{13}$$

where $\mathrm{Var}(Z_j^\epsilon(x)) = \mathbb{E}|Z_j^\epsilon(x)|^2$. Here is a lemma about the two measure τ_j and ν_j.

Lemma 2 *(a) There exist almost surely positive finite random variables $\mathcal{G}_j$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, satisfying $\mathbb{E}\mathcal{G}_j^q < \infty$ for any $q \in \mathbb{R}$, such that*

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{G}_j}\tau_j(B) \le \nu_j(B) \le \mathcal{G}_j \tau_j(B),$$

for any Borel set $B \subset [0, 1)$.

(b) For each fixed $\beta_j < \sqrt{2}$, there exist $a_j^{(l)} = a_j^{(l)}(\beta_j), \tilde{a}_j^{(l)} = \tilde{a}_j^{(l)}(\beta_j) > 0, l = 1, 2$, and almost surely finite random constants $c_j = c_j(\omega, \beta_j), \tilde{c}_j = \tilde{c}_j(\omega, \beta_j) > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{c_j(\omega, \beta_j)}|I|^{a_j^{(1)}} \le \tau_j(I) \le c_j(\omega, \beta_j)|I|^{a_j^{(2)}}, \quad \frac{1}{\tilde{c}_j(\omega, \beta_j)}|I|^{\tilde{a}_j^{(1)}} \le \nu_j(I) \le \tilde{c}_j(\omega, \beta_j)|I|^{\tilde{a}_j^{(2)}}$$

for each subinterval $I \subset [0, 1)$.

Proof. By Lemma 1(ii) and the stationary properties of the fields $Y_\epsilon(x)$ and $Z_\epsilon(x)$, we deduce that (a) holds. It is easy to see from (12) and (13), combined with the constructions Y_j^ϵ and Z_j^ϵ, that τ_j and ν_j are the same measures as τ and ν in [2], respectively. So it follows from [2, Theorem 3.7] that (b) holds. □

Now we are able to define the random homeomorphism on the boundary component ∂U_j of Ω, which is guaranteed by Lemma 2(b).

Definition 2 *Let a_j and r_j be the center and radius of the circle ∂U_j, and let $\beta_j < \sqrt{2}, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. Then the random homeomorphism $\psi_j : \partial U_j \to \partial U_j$ can be obtained by setting*

$$\psi_j(a_j + r_j e^{2\pi i x}) = a_j + r_j e^{2\pi i p_j(x)}, \tag{14}$$

where $p_j(x)$ is given by

$$p_j(x) = p_{\beta_j}(x) = \frac{\tau_j([0, x])}{\tau_j([0, 1))} \tag{15}$$

for $x \in [0, 1)$ and is extended periodically over the real line $\mathbb{R}$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$.

Thus we obtain m random homeomorphisms ψ_j, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, on the boundary components ∂U_j of Ω, which have the following properties.

Lemma 3 *Suppose that $\beta_j < \sqrt{2}, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. Then (i) almost surely both ψ_j and its inverse mapping ψ_j^{-1} are Hölder continuous for any $1 \le j \le m$; (ii) the distribution of ψ_j is invariant under any Möbius transformation of $\mathbb{S}^2$.*

Proof. It is obvious that (i) can follow from the definition of ψ_j and Lemma 2(b). In the following we will prove (ii), i.e., to show that $\chi \circ \psi_j \circ \chi^{-1}$ and ψ_j have identical distributions for any Möbius transformation χ of $\mathbb{S}^2$. First, we show that h_j is conformally invariant for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. Indeed, $h_j = h|_{\partial U_j}$ may be viewed as the restriction of the 2-dimensional GFF h_j on $\mathbb{C}$ to ∂U_j, whose covariance function $G_{h_j}(\zeta, \zeta')$ is given by (5).

Let $\chi : \mathbb{S}^2 \to \mathbb{S}^2$ be any Möbius transformation, and set $\tilde{h}_j = h|_{\partial \tilde{U}_j}$, where $\partial \tilde{U}_j = \chi(\partial U_j)$, which could be also identified with $[0, 1)$. Then from the expressions (5) of $G_{h_j}(\zeta, \zeta')$ and $G_{\tilde{h}_j}(\chi(\zeta), \chi(\zeta'))$ we deduce that

$$G_{\tilde{h}_j}(\chi(\zeta), \chi(\zeta')) = G_{h_j}(\zeta, \zeta') + Q_{j,1}(\zeta) + Q_{j,2}(\zeta'),$$

where $Q_{j,1}$ (respectively, $Q_{j,2}$) are independent of ζ' (respectively, ζ). This implies that

$$\int_{\partial \tilde{U}_j \times \partial \tilde{U}_j} g_1(\chi^{-1}(w)) G_{\tilde{h}_j}(w, w') g_2(\chi^{-1}(w')) dw dw' = \int_{\partial U_j \times \partial U_j} g_1(\zeta) G(\zeta, \zeta') g_2(\zeta') d\zeta d\zeta', \quad (16)$$

where g_1 and g_2 are mean-zero test-functions whose integrals over ∂U_j vanish. Since $(h, g)_\nabla$ is a Gaussian random variable with zero mean for each $g \in H(\mathbb{C})$, the distribution of $h_j = h|_{U_j}$ is uniquely determined by its covariances. So we conclude from (16) that h_j and $\tilde{h}_j$ have identical distributions for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$.

Next, Let τ_j and $\tilde{\tau}_j$ be random measures corresponding to h_j and $\tilde{h}_j$ respectively, as defined in (12) and (13). Then the equivalence of distributions of h_j and $\tilde{h}_j$ implies that τ_j and $\tilde{\tau}_j$ have the same laws. Hence it follows from (15) that $p_j(x) \sim \tilde{p}_j(x)$, where $\tilde{p}_j(x) = \tilde{\tau}_j[0, x]/\tilde{\tau}_j[0, 1], x \in [0, 1)$, that is, $p_j(x)$ is conformally invariant. Thus we conclude from (14) that the distribution of the random homeomorphism ψ_j is identified with $\chi \circ \psi_j \circ \chi^{-1}$. This completes the proof of the lemma. □

4 The extension of random homeomorphisms

In this section based on the approach of the Beuring-Ahlfors extension [3], we shall describe how to extend the random homeomorphism $\psi_j : \partial U_j \to \partial U_j$ constructed in Section 3.2 to the multiply connected domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{S}^2$, and then give a geometric estimate of the corresponding distortion function in terms of ψ_j and a estimate for the associated Lehto integral. Finally, we discuss the uniqueness of the random conformal welding of Ω induced by ψ_j, which involves the conformal removability of the boundary of Ω.

4.1 Construction of the extension mapping

For the multiply connected domain $\Omega = \mathbb{C}\setminus\cup_{j=1}^m \bar{U}_j$ as defined before, without loss of generality we may assume that

$$\text{dist}(\partial U_i, \partial U_j) \geq re^{4\pi} \tag{17}$$

for any pair $(i,j), i \neq j$, where $r = \max_{1\leq j\leq m}\{r_j\}$. Otherwise, consider another multiply connected domain $\tilde{\Omega} = \mathbb{C} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^m \tilde{U}_j$ whose boundary components satisfy (17), where ∂U_k are replaced by $\partial\tilde{U}_k$ and r is replaced by $\tilde{r}$. By Koebe's Theorem and analytic continuations on ∂U_j we can find a conformal mapping φ from a domain $N_\Omega \supset \Omega$ onto another domain $N_{\tilde{\Omega}} \supset \tilde{\Omega}$ such that $\varphi(\partial U_j) = \partial\tilde{U}_j$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. It follows from Lemma 3(ii) that the random homeomorphism ψ_j on ∂U_j is equivalent in law to the corresponding one on $\partial\tilde{U}_j$.

Write

$$N_{U_j} = \{z \in \bar{\Omega} : |z - a_j| < r_j e^{4\pi}\},\ N^c_{U_j} = \bar{\Omega} \setminus N_{U_j} = \{z \in \bar{\Omega} : |z - a_j| \geq r_j e^{4\pi}\}$$

for $j = 1, 2 \ldots, m$, which will be used below.

We first describe how to extend $\psi_1 : \partial U_1 \to \partial U_1$ to Ω. The definition of ψ_1 (see (14) and (15)) gives that the random homeomorphism $p_1 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies

$$p_1(x + 1) = p_1(x) + 1,\ p_1(0) = 0. \tag{18}$$

Thus we can extend p_1 to the upper half plane $\mathbb{H}$ according to the techniques of Beuring-Ahlfors [3]. To be more concrete, we let

$$F_1(x + iy) = \frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 (p_1(x + ty) + p_1(x - ty))dt + i\int_0^1 (p_1(x + ty) - p_1(x - ty))dt \tag{19}$$

for $0 < y < 1$. Then it is easy to see that $F_1 = p_1$ on $\mathbb{R}$ and F_1 is a continuously differentiable homeomorphism. Furthermore, from (18) and (19) we may set $F_1(z) = z + (2 - y)M_0$ for $1 \leq y \leq 2$, where $M_0 = \int_0^1 p_1(t)dt - 1/2$. This implies that we are able to take $F_1(z) \equiv z$ for $y \geq 2$. In addition, it is clear that one has

$$F_1(z + k) = F_1(z) + k \tag{20}$$

for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore, F_1 is the desired extension of p_1 to $\mathbb{H}$.

Hence, the extension of ψ_1 to the disk U_1, denoted by $\tilde{\Phi}_1$, can be given by

$$\tilde{\Phi}_1(z) = a_1 + r_1 \exp(2\pi i F_1(\frac{\log((z - a_1)/r_1)}{2\pi i})),\ z \in U_1. \tag{21}$$

It is easy to see from (14) and (20) that $\tilde{\Phi}_1$ is a well-defined homeomorphism of U_1 with $\tilde{\Phi}_1|_{\partial U_1} = \psi_1$ and $\tilde{\Phi}_1(z) \equiv z$ for $|z - a_1| \leq r_1 e^{-4\pi}$. Let U_1^c denote the exterior of the disk U_1,

Then by the reflection around the circle ∂U_1 we obtain the extension of ψ_1 to U_1^c, denoted by Φ_1^c, which is expressed by

$$\Phi_1^c(z) := a_1 + \frac{r_1^2}{\overline{\tilde{\Phi}_1(z^*)} - \bar{a}_1}, \ z^* = a_1 + \frac{r^2}{\bar{z} - \bar{a}_1}, \ z \in U_1^c. \tag{22}$$

It is clear that $\Phi_1^c|_{\partial U_1} = \psi_1$. Moreover, a simple computation gives that $\Phi_1^c(z) \equiv z \quad$ for $|z - a_1| \geq r_1 e^{4\pi}$. Thus we let

$$\Phi_1 = \Phi_1^c|_\Omega, \tag{23}$$

the restriction of Φ_1^c to Ω. Then Φ_1 is the extension of ψ_1 to Ω which satisfies $\Phi_1|_{\partial U_1} = \psi_1$ and $\Phi_1 = I$ on $N_{U_1}^c$, where I denotes the identity mapping. This, combined with the condition (17), implies that $\Phi_1|_{\partial U_j} = I, j = 2, \ldots, m$, where we used the fact that $\partial U_m = \partial U_m^c$.

Secondly, find the extension of ψ_j to Ω for $j = 2, \ldots, m-1$. After ψ_1 has been extended to Ω, the homeomorphism ψ_2 on ∂U_2 is transformed to $\Phi_1 \circ \psi_2 \circ \Phi_1^{-1}$ on $\Phi_1(\partial U_2)$. Notice that Φ_1 is an identity mapping on ∂U_2. So we get that $\Phi_1 \circ \psi_2 \circ \Phi_1^{-1} = \psi_2$. Thus applying the same method to ψ_2, we obtain the extension mapping Φ_2 of Ω which satisfies $\Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1|_{\partial U_j} = \psi_j, j = 1, 2$ and $\Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1 = I$ on $N_{U_1}^c \cap N_{U_2}^c$. It follows from (17) that $\Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1|_{\partial U_j} = I, j = 3, \ldots, m$. Repeating the above procedure until ψ_{m-1} has been considered, we obtain $m-1$ extension mappings Φ_j of Ω corresponding to ψ_j which satisfy $\Phi_{m-1} \circ \cdots \circ \Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1|_{\partial U_j} = \psi_j, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m-1$ and $\Phi_{m-1} \circ \cdots \circ \Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1 = I$ on $N_{U_1}^c \cap N_{U_2}^c \cap \cdots \cap N_{U_{m-1}}^c$. Based on the same reason as above, we have $\Phi_{m-1} \circ \cdots \circ \Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1|_{\partial U_m} = I$.

Thirdly, seek the extension of ψ_m to Ω. After the extension mapping Φ_j of ψ_j have been obtained as above for $j = 1, \ldots, m-1$, the homeomorphism ψ_m on ∂U_m is transformed to $\Phi_{m-1} \cdots \circ \Phi_1 \circ \psi_m \circ \Phi_1^{-1} \circ \ldots, \Phi_{m-1}^{-1}$ on $\Phi_{m-1} \cdots \circ \Phi_1(\partial U_m)$. Since $\Phi_{m-1} \circ \cdots \circ \Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1|_{\partial U_m} = I$, $\Phi_{m-1} \cdots \circ \Phi_1 \circ \psi_m \circ \Phi_1^{-1} \circ \ldots, \Phi_{m-1}^{-1} = \psi_m$. Similarly to construction of $\tilde{\Phi}_1$ instead of Φ_1^c, by the condition (17) we can find the extension Φ_m of ψ_m to U_m^c such that $\Phi_m \circ \cdots \circ \Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1|_{\partial U_j} = \psi_j, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$ and $\Phi_m \circ \cdots \circ \Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1(\Omega) = \Omega$.

Finally, set $\Phi = \Phi_m \circ \Phi_{m-1} \circ \cdots \circ \Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1$. Then $\Phi : \Omega \to \Omega$ is a well-defined random homeomorphism which satisfies $\Phi|_{\partial U_j} = \psi_j$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. So Φ is the desired extension of $(\psi_1, \psi_2, \ldots, \psi_m)$ to the multiply connected region Ω.

4.2 Estimates of the distortion function

Let K_Φ and K_{Φ_j} denote the distortion functions of Φ and Φ_j, respectively. It follows from the distortion properties of quasiconformal mappings that

$$K_\Phi(z) = K_{\Phi_m}(z_{m-1}) \circ \cdots \circ K_{\Phi_2}(z_1) \circ K_{\Phi_1}(z), \ z \in \Omega, \tag{24}$$

where $z_j = \Phi_j(z_{j-1}), j = 1, 2, \ldots, m-1$ and $z_0 = z$. Note that $\Phi_j = I$ on $N^c_{U_j}$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, where $N^c_{U_j}$ is defined in Section 4.1. So we deduce from (24) that

$$K_\Phi(z) = \begin{cases} K_{\Phi_j}(z), & \text{if } z \in N_{U_j}, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m, \\ 1, & \text{if } z \in \cap_{j=1}^m N^c_{U_j}, \end{cases} \tag{25}$$

which reduces all estimates of K_Φ to $K_{\Phi_j}|_{N_{U_j}}$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. On the other hand, since the distortion properties are conformally invariant, we conclude from the construction of Φ_j that

$$K_{\Phi_j}|_{N_{U_j}} = K_{F_j}|_S \tag{26}$$

for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, where F_j is defined in the same way as F_1 in Section 4.1, and $S = \mathbb{R} \times [0, 2]$.

We will give a geometric estimate for the distortion function K_Φ in terms of the random homeomorphisms on the boundary components of Ω, and estimate the geometric distortion of an annulus in Ω under Φ. To this end, we need to introduce the following notation which is similar to those in [2]. Let $\mathcal{B}_n$ denote the set of all dyadic intervals of length 2^{-n}, that is,

$$\mathcal{B}_n = \{[k2^{-n}, (k+1)2^{-n}] : k \in \mathbb{Z}\},$$

and set $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathcal{B}_n : n \geq 0\}$. For a pair of intervals $\mathbf{J} = \{J_1, J_2\} \subset \mathcal{B}$, let

$$\delta_{\tau_j}(\mathbf{J}) = \frac{\tau_j(J_1)}{\tau_j(J_2)} + \frac{\tau_j(J_2)}{\tau_j(J_1)},$$

where τ_j is the random measure (12). Set $C_I = \{(x, y) : x \in I, 2^{-n-1} \leq y \leq 2^{-n}\}$ for any $I \in \mathcal{B}_n, n > 0$, and $C_I = I \times [1/2, 2]$ for $I \in \mathcal{B}_0$. Then $\{C_I\}_{I \in \mathcal{B}}$ paves the strip $S = \mathbb{R} \times [0, 2]$. Moreover, for a dyadic interval $I \in \mathcal{B}_n$ we let $j(I)$ denote the union of I and its neighbors in $\mathcal{B}_n$. Write

$$\Lambda(I) := \{\mathbf{J} = (J_1, J_2) : J_i \in \mathcal{B}_{n+5} \text{ and } J_i \in j(I)\}.$$

We define

$$K_{\tau_j}(I) := \sum_{\mathbf{J} \in \Lambda(I)} \delta_{\tau_j}(\mathbf{J})$$

for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$.

In addition, let $B(z, r, R) = \{w \in \mathbb{C} : r < |w - z| < R\} \subset \Omega$ where $0 \leq r \leq R < \infty$. The Lehto integral of K_Φ corresponding to $B(z, r, R)$ is given by

$$L(z, r, R) := L_{K_\Phi}(z, r, R) := \int_r^R \frac{1}{\int_0^{2\pi} K_\Phi(z + \rho e^{i\theta}) d\theta} \frac{d\rho}{\rho}; \tag{27}$$

also see [15, 1]. For any bounded topological annulus $\tilde{B} \in \mathbb{C}$, let $D_o(\tilde{B})$ and $D_I(\tilde{B})$ denote its outer diameter and inner diameter, respectively.

Lemma 4 *Let Φ be the extension of the random homeomorphisms $\psi_1, \psi_2, \ldots, \psi_m$ to Ω as constructed above, and K_Φ be its distortion function. Then (a) there exists a constant $M > 0$ such that*

$$K_\Phi(z) \le \max_{1\le j\le m}\{\sup_{w\in C_I} K_{F_j}(w)\} \le M \max_{1\le j\le m}\{K_{\tau_j}(I)\} \tag{28}$$

for each $z \in N_{U_j} \subset \Omega$, where $C_I \subset S \subset \mathbb{H}$ contains the point corresponding to z via the relationship between Φ_j and F_j which is given by (21), (22) and (23) (the subindex 1 is replaced by j) for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m-1$, and by (21) (the subindex 1 is replaced by m) for $j = m$.

(b) It holds that

$$\frac{D_o(\Phi(B(z,r,R))}{D_I(\Phi(B(z,r,R))} \ge \frac{1}{16} e^{2\pi^2 L_{K_{\Phi_j}}(z,r,R)} \tag{29}$$

for any annulus $B(z,r,R) \subset N_{U_j} \subset \Omega$ $(j = 1, 2, \ldots, m)$.

Proof. By the relationship between Φ_j and F_j, we get that for each $z \in N_{U_j} \subset \Omega$, there exists a $w \in C_I \subset S$ corresponding to z. Note that each F_j is a quasiconformal mapping from $\mathbb{H}$ onto itself, which is obtained by the extension of the random homeomorphism $p_j : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ to $\mathbb{H}$. So we deduce the first inequality of (28) from (25) and (26). Applying [2, Theorem 2.6] to any F_j, we have

$$\sup_{w\in C_I} K_{F_j}(w) \le M_j K_{\tau_j}(I),$$

where $M_j > 0$ is a universal constant. Thus, setting $M = \max_{1\le j\le m} M_j$, we conclude that the second inequality of (28) holds.

It follows from the construction of Φ that $\Phi(B(z,r,R)) = \Phi_j(B(z,r,R))$ for each annulus $B(z,r,R) \subset N_{U_j} \subset \Omega$. For the quasiconformal mapping Φ_j, we get from [2, Lemma 2.3] that

$$\frac{D_o(\Phi_j(B(z,r,R))}{D_I(\Phi_j(B(z,r,R))} \ge \frac{1}{16} e^{2\pi^2 L_{K_{\Phi_j}}(z,r,R)}.$$

This yields that (29) holds. Thus we finish the proof of the lemma. □

Now, in the light of (28) we may define K_{τ_j} in the upper half-plane $\mathbb{H}$ by setting

$$K_{\tau_j}(z) := K_{\tau_j}(I)$$

for $z \in C_I$. Then a lower bound for the Lehto integral (27) can be obtained through replacing K_Φ by K_{τ_j}. In the same manner, we may define $K_{\nu_j}(z)(z \in \mathbb{H})$ via the modified Bearling-Ahlfors extension of the periodic homeomorphism produced by the measure ν_j, as in Section 4.1. Thus, in order to show that almost surely there exist infinitely many annuli around each point on $\partial\Omega$ which are not distorted much by the quasiconformal mapping Φ, we need the following proposition on probabilistic estimates for Lehto integrals and the almost sure integrability of the distortions.

Proposition 1 *Let $\beta_j < \sqrt{2}$, and let K_{ν_j} be defined as above for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. Then (i) for each $w \in \mathbb{R}$, there exist $\sigma > 0$, $r_0 > 0$ and $\delta(r) > 0$ such that for any positive $r < r_0$ and $\delta < \delta(r)$ the Lehto integral of K_{ν_j} satisfies the probabilistic estimate*

$$\mathbb{P}(L_{K_{\nu_j}}(w, r^n, 2r) < n\delta) \leq r^{(1+\sigma)n}, n \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{30}$$

for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, where $L_{K_{\nu_j}}(w, r^n, 2r)$ is defined in (27).

(ii) Almost surely $K_{\nu_j} \in L^1([0,1] \times [0,2])$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$.

Proof. Notice that the probability law of ν_j is equal to that of ν in [2] for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. So for each K_{ν_j}, we deduce from [2, Theorem 4.1] that there exists $\sigma_j > 0$, $r_{j,0} > 0$ and $\delta_j(r) > 0$ such that for any positive $r < r_{j,0} (r = 2^{-p}, p \in \mathbb{N})$ and $\delta < \delta_j(r)$ the Lehto integral satisfies the estimate

$$\mathbb{P}(L_{K_{\nu_j}}(w, r^n, 2r) < n\delta) \leq r^{(1+\sigma_j)n}, n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Take $\sigma = \min_{1 \leq j \leq m} \sigma_j$, $r_0 = \min(1, \min_{1 \leq j \leq m} r_{j,0})$ and $\delta(r) = \min_{1 \leq j \leq m} \delta_j(r)$. Then we can obtain that (30) holds. It is easy to see that (ii) follows from [2, Lemma 4.5]. This completes the proof of the proposition. □

4.3 Uniqueness of the welding

In order to prove the uniqueness of random conformal welding for the multiply connected domain Ω, we need the following lemma involving the conformal removability of boundary of the multiply connected region, which generalizes the conformal removability result [9] of boundary of the simply connected domain to the multiply connected case.

Recall a compact set $E \subset D$ is confromally removable inside a domain $D \subset \mathbb{S}^2$, if any homeomorphism of D, which is conformal on $D \setminus E$, is conformal on D. Let $\Omega = \mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \cup_{j=1}^m \bar{U}_j$ be defined as before, and $\tilde{\Omega} = \mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \cup_{j=1}^m \bar{\Omega}_j$ be any m-connected domain in $\mathbb{S}^2$. Koebe's Theorem gives that there exists a conformal mapping Ψ of Ω onto $\tilde{\Omega}$. This conformal mapping Ψ is called the Koebe mapping. The uniqueness of conformal welding for Ω is a consequence of the following Lemma.

Lemma 5 *Let $\tilde{\Omega} = \mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \cup_{j=1}^m \bar{\Omega}_j$ be an m-connected region such that the Koebe mapping $\Psi : \Omega = \mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \cup_{j=1}^m \bar{U}_j \to \tilde{\Omega}$ is α-Hölder continuous for some $\alpha > 0$, where $U_j \subset \mathbb{S}^2$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, are mutually disjoint disks, and $\Omega_j \subset \mathbb{S}^2$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, are mutually disjoint simply connected domains. Then the boundary $\partial\tilde{\Omega} = \cup_{j=1}^m \partial\Omega_j$ is conformally removable.*

Proof. We first show that every $\partial\Omega_j$ is conformally removable. It follows from [6, 17] that the mapping Ψ can be written as a composition of m conformal mappings of simply connected domains, i.e., there exist conformal mappings Ψ_j, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$ of simply connected domains into $\mathbb{S}^2$ such that

$$\Psi = \Psi_m \circ \cdots \circ \Psi_2 \circ \Psi_1 \quad \text{on} \quad \Omega. \tag{31}$$

Set $U_j^c := \mathbb{S}^2 \setminus U_j$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. So $U_j^{c\prime}s$ are simply connected domains with pairwise disjoint complements, and $\partial\Omega = \cup_{j=1}^m \partial U_j^c = \cup_{j=1}^m \partial U_j$. From (31) we deduce that $\Psi_m \circ \cdots \circ \Psi_2 \circ \Psi_1$ maps U_j^c conformally onto $\mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \Omega_j$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. Moreover, $\Psi_m \circ \cdots \circ \Psi_2 \circ \Psi_1|_{\partial U_j^c} = \Psi|_{\partial U_j^c}$. Thus by the assumption of Ψ one sees that $\Psi_m \circ \cdots \circ \Psi_2 \circ \Psi_1|_{\partial U_j^c}$ is α-Hölder continuous for any j. Hence, from the result of conformal removability for the boundary of simply connected domain (see [9] or[2, Theorem 2.4]), we get that $\partial\Omega_j = \partial(\mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \Omega_j)$ is conformally removable for each $j = 1, \cdots, m$.

Next, we demonstrate that $\partial\tilde{\Omega}$ is conformally removable. Indeed, let χ be any homeomorphism of $\mathbb{S}^2$ which is conformal off $\partial\tilde{\Omega} = \cup_{j=1}^m \partial\Omega_j$. Since $\partial\Omega_j \subset \mathbb{S}^2$, $j = 1, \cdots, m$, are mutually disjoint compact sets, there exists a simply connected neighborhood $N_{\partial\Omega_j} \supset \partial\Omega_j$ for each $\partial\Omega_j$ such that $N_{\partial\Omega_j}$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, are pairwise disjoint. Thus $\chi|_{N_{\partial\Omega_j}}$ is a homeomorphism of $N_{\partial\Omega_j}$ which is conformal off $\partial\Omega_j$. Since we have proved that each $\partial\Omega_j$ is conformally removable, $\chi|_{N_{\partial\Omega_j}}$ may be extended conformally to the whole neighborhood $N_{\partial\Omega_j}$. This yields that χ is conformal in the whole sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$. So we get from the definition of conformal removability that $\partial\tilde{\Omega} = \cup_{j=1}^m \Omega_j$ is conformally removable. This completes the proof of the lemma. □

Proposition 2 *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{S}^2$ be an m-connected domain whose complement is a union of mutually disjoint closed disks $\bar{U}_j, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$ for any fixed integer $m \geq 2$, and let $\psi_j : \partial U_j \to \partial U_j$ be random homeomorphisms on the boundary components ∂U_j of Ω. Suppose that there exists a random conformal mapping f from Ω into $\mathbb{S}^2$ and a random conformal mapping g_j from U_j into $\mathbb{S}^2$ such that their boundary values satisfy (2). Assume further that f is α-Hölder continuous on the boundary $\partial\Omega = \cup_{j=1}^m \partial U_j$ (equivalently g_j is α-Hölder continuous on ∂U_j for each j). Then the welding is unique: any other tuple of welding mappings $(\tilde{f}, \tilde{g}_1, \ldots, \tilde{g}_m)$ corresponding to ψ_j is of the form*

$$\tilde{f} = \chi \circ f, \quad \tilde{g}_j = \chi \circ g_j, \tag{32}$$

where $\chi : \mathbb{S}^2 \to \mathbb{S}^2$ is a Möbius transformation.

Proof. Assume that $(\tilde{f}, \tilde{g}_1, \ldots, \tilde{g}_m)$ is another tuple of welding mappings admitted by ψ_j, $j = 1, \cdots, m$. Note that the boundary values of both $(f, g_1, \ldots, g_m)$ and $(\tilde{f}, \tilde{g}_1, \ldots, \tilde{g}_m)$ satisfy the welding condition (2). So we have

$$\tilde{f}^{-1} \circ \tilde{g}_j(z) = \phi_j(z) = f^{-1} \circ g_j(z), \quad z \in \partial U_j$$

for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. This, combined with the equality $f(\Omega) \cup f(\partial\Omega) \cup_{j=1}^m g_j(U_j) = \tilde{f}(\Omega) \cup \tilde{f}(\partial\Omega) \cup_{j=1}^m \tilde{g}_j(U_j) = \mathbb{S}^2$, implies that

$$\chi(z) = \begin{cases} \tilde{f} \circ f^{-1}(z), & \text{if } z \in f(\Omega), \\ \tilde{g}_j \circ g_j^{-1}(z), & \text{if } z \in g_j(U_j) (j = 1, 2, \ldots, m) \end{cases}$$

defines a homeomorphism of $\mathbb{S}^2$ which is conformal off $f(\partial\Omega) = \cup_{j=1}^m f_j(\partial U_j)$. Since f is α-Hölder continuous on the boundary $\partial\Omega = \cup_{j=1}^m \partial U_j$, it follows from Lemma 5 that $f(\partial\Omega)$ is

conformally removable. The definition of conformal removability gives that χ can be extended conformally to the entire sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$. Hence we get that χ is a Möbius transformation of $\mathbb{S}^2$ which satisfies (32). So we finish the proof. □

5 Random conformal welding theorems

In this section we will establish random conformal welding theorems for the multiply connected domain Ω. The random welding problem for Ω is first reduced to solving the associated Beltrami equation (Theorem 1). Then from the existence of the solution to the Beltrami equation, and the uniqueness of the solution (Proposition 2), we obtain the desired solution to the random welding problem (Theorem 2). Finally, we present one result of random conformal welding with the random homeomorphism on each boundary component of Ω arising from two independent Gaussian free fields (Theorem 3).

Theorem 1 *Suppose that Ω is an m-connected domain of the Riemann sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$ whose complement is a union of disjoint closed disks $\bar{U}_j$, $j = 1, \cdots, m$ for any fixed integer $m \geq 2$. Assume that $\beta_j < \sqrt{2}$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. Let $\psi_j : \partial U_j \to \partial U_j$ be the random circle homeomorphism corresponding to β_j as defined in Section 3.2, and let $\Phi : \Omega \to \Omega$ be the homeomorphism which extends $\psi_1, \psi_2, \ldots, \phi_m$ as constructed in Section 4.1. Let*

$$\lambda = \lambda_\Phi := \frac{\partial_{\bar{z}}\Phi}{\partial_z \Phi}$$

be the complex dilatation of the extension on Ω, and set $\lambda = 0$ on $\bar{U}_j$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$.

Then almost surely there exists a random homeomorphic $W^{1,1}_{loc}$-solution $F : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ to the Beltrami equation

$$\partial_{\bar{z}} F = \lambda \partial_z F, \quad a.e. \ in \quad \mathbb{C}, \tag{33}$$

which satisfies the normalization $F(z) = z + o(z)$ as $z \to \infty$. In addition, there exists a positive constant α such that the restriction $F|_{\partial U_j} : \partial U_j \to \mathbb{C}$ is a.s. α-Hölder continuous for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$.

Proof. In the proof we adopt the idea of [2, Theorem 5.1] or [1, Theorem 20.9.4]. First of all, we derive the estimates for K_Φ and the Lehto integral of the distortion function K_{τ_j} in the upper half-plane $\mathbb{H}$. For each integer $n \geq 1$ we take $M_n = [r^{-(1+\sigma/2)n}] \in \mathbb{N}$ where σ is as in Proposition 1(i). For any $j : 1 \leq j \leq m$, we let

$$z^{(j)}_{n,k} := a_j + r_j e^{2\pi i k/M_n}$$

for $k = 1, 2, \ldots, M_n$, and write $Z^{(j)}_n := \{z^{(j)}_{n,1}, z^{(j)}_{n,2}, \ldots, z^{(j)}_{n,M_n}\}$. Then for each $j = 1, \cdots, m$, the distance from ∂U_j to the set $Z^{(j)}_n$ is bounded by $\pi r_j/M_n \sim r^{(1+\sigma/2)n}$. For a given $n \geq 1$ and $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, M_n\}$, let $E^{(j)}_{n,k}$ denote the event

$$E^{(j)}_{n,k} = \{\omega : L_{K_{\nu_j}}(k/M_n, r^n, 2r) < n\delta\}$$

for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$ and write $E_n^{(j)} = \cup_{k=1}^{M_n} E_{n,k}^{(j)}$. Then we obtain from Proposition 1(i) that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(E_n^{(j)}) \le \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{M_n} \mathbb{P}(E_{n,k}^{(j)}) \le \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} M_n r^{(1+\sigma)n} \le \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} r^{\sigma n/2} < \infty$$

for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. Borel-Cantelli's lemma implies that for almost every ω there exists an $n_0(\omega) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that ω belongs to the complement of the event $\cup_{n=n_0}^{\infty} E_n^{(j)}, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$.

It follows from Lemma 2(a), combined with the definitions of K_{τ_j} and K_{ν_j}, that

$$K_{\tau_j} \le X_j^2 K_{\nu_j}$$

for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, where almost surely $X_j < \infty$. So by Lemma 4 (a) and Proposition 1(ii) we deduce that almost surely

$$\int_{[0,1]\times[0,2]} K_{F_j}(w)dw \le M \max_{1\le j\le m} \int_{[0,1]\times[0,2]} K_{\tau_j}(w)dw \le M \max_{1\le j\le m} \{X_j^2 \int_{[0,1]\times[0,2]} K_{\nu_j}(w)dw\} < \infty.$$

Thus, for a fixed event ω_0 and its corresponding extension Φ on Ω with the complex dilatation λ, we get from (25) that the distortion

$$K = K_\Phi = \frac{1 + |\lambda|}{1 - |\lambda|} \tag{34}$$

satisfies

$$K_\Phi(z) = K_{\Phi_j}(z) = K_{F_j}(w) \le M K_{\tau_j}(w) \le M X_j(\omega_0)^2 K_{\nu_j}(w)$$

for $z \in N_{U_j} \subset \Omega, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, where $w \in \mathbb{H}$ is a point corresponding to z through the mappings Φ_j and F_j; and $K_\Phi(z) = 1$ for $w \in \Omega \setminus \cup_{j=1}^m N_{U_j}$. Also, $K_{\nu_j} \in L^1 \cap L^\infty_{\text{loc}}([0,1] \times (0,2])$, and for any $n \ge n_0(\omega_0)$ and $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, M_n\}$ we obtain from the definition of Lehto's integral that

$$L_{K_{\tau_j}}(k/M_n, r^n, 2r) \ge X_j(\omega_0)^{-2} L_{K_{\nu_j}}(k/M_n, r^n, 2r) \ge n \min_{1\le j\le m} \{\delta X_j(\omega_0)^{-2}\} =: n\tilde{\delta}. \tag{35}$$

Secondly, we consider the sequence $\{\lambda_l\}$ whose limit is λ and show that the solutions to Beltrami equations with λ_l converge uniformly on compact sets of Ω to the solution of (33) in the light of Arzela-Ascoli's thorem. To this end, we take

$$\lambda_l := \frac{l}{l+1}\lambda, \quad l \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let F_l denote the corresponding solution of the Beltrami equation with coefficient λ_l, which satisfies the normalization

$$F_l = z + o(1) \quad \text{as} \quad z \to 0. \tag{36}$$

Then each F_l is a quasiconformal homeomorphism of $\mathbb{C}$.

Let G_l denote the inverse mapping of F_l, i.e., $G_l = F_l^{-1}$. Note that $\Omega = U_m^c \setminus \cup_{j=1}^{m-1} U_j$, where $U_m^c = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - a_m| < r_m\}$ is a disk with finite radius r_m, and $\lambda_l(z) \equiv 0$ for $z \in U_j, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m-1$. According to [1, Lemma 20.2.3], we can deduce that

$$|G_l(w_1) - G_l(w_2)| \le \frac{16\pi^2}{\log(e + |w_1 - w_2|^{-1})}(|w_1|^2 + |w_2|^2 + \int_\Omega \frac{1 + |\lambda_l(z)|}{1 - |\lambda_l(z)|} dz) \tag{37}$$

for any $w_1, w_2 \in \mathbb{C}$. At the same time, observe that for $z \in N_{U_j} (j = 1, 2, \ldots, m)$, one has

$$\frac{1 + |\lambda_l(z)|}{1 - |\lambda_l(z)|} \le K_\Phi(z) \le M K_{\tau_j}(w),$$

where w is the point in $\mathbb{H}$ corresponding to z through Φ_j and F_j, and $K_{\tau_j} \in L^1([0,1] \times [0,2])$. This gives that the integral in (37) is uniformly bounded with respect to l. Hence we conclude that for any $l \in \mathbb{N}$, the left hand side of the inequality in (37) tends to zero as $|w_1 - w_2| \to 0$, which yields that the sequence of $\{G_l\}$ forms an equicontinuous family.

We next show that the family $\{F_l\}$ is equicontinuous, too. For any $z \in \Omega$ we set $d = \min_{1 \le j \le m} \operatorname{dist}(z, \partial U_j)/2$. It is easy to see that K in (34) is bounded on $B(z, d)$. Since

$$K_l := K_{F_l}(\cdot) \le K$$

for any $l \ge 1$, we get that for $b \in (0, d/2)$

$$L_{K_l}(z, b, r_m) \ge L_K(z, b, d) \ge \frac{1}{\|K\|_{L^\infty(B(w,d))}} \log \frac{d}{b} \to 0$$

as $b \to 0$. In addition, we get from Koebe's theorem or [1, Corollary 2.10.2] that

$$F_l(2U_m^c) \subset 5U_m^c,$$

which implies that $\operatorname{diam}(F_l(B(z, r_m)) \le 5r_m$. Thus by Lemma 4(b) we can deduce that $\operatorname{diam}(F_l(B(z, b)))$ converges to 0 uniformly in l, as $b \to 0$. This gives that F_l is equicontinuous at every point $z \in \Omega$. Since F_l is conformal on U_j for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$ and satisfies (36), the equicontinuity of F_l in U_j follows from Koebe's theorem.

Now we will prove the equicontinuity of F_l on $\partial\Omega = \cup_{j=1}^m \partial U_j$. It suffices to prove local equicontinuity on points of $[0, 1]$ for the families

$$\tilde{F}_l^{(j)}(t) = F_l(a_j + r_j e^{2\pi i t}), \ j = 1, 2 \ldots, m.$$

Assume that $n \ge n_0(\omega_0)$. Observe that $\operatorname{diam}(\tilde{F}_l^{(j)}(B(k/M_n, 2r))) \le \operatorname{diam}(F_l(B(z_{n,k}^{(j)}, r_m))) \le 5r_m$, which, combined with Lemma 4(b) and (35), implies that

$$\operatorname{diam}(\tilde{F}_l^{(j)}(B(k/M_n, r^n))) \le \operatorname{diam}(\tilde{F}_l^{(j)}(B(k/M_n, 2r)))16e^{-2\pi^2 n\tilde{\delta}} \le 80 r_m e^{-n\tilde{c}}. \tag{38}$$

Since the set $Z_n^{(j)} = \{z_{n,1}^{(j)}, z_{n,2}^{(j)}, \ldots, z_{n,M_n}^{(j)}\}$ is evenly spread on ∂U_j for each $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$, the balls $B(z_{n,j}^{(j)}, r^{n+1})$ cover the r^{n+2}-neighborhood of ∂U_j in such a way that any two points

in this neighborhood, whose distance is less than or equal to r^{n+2}, lie in the same ball. Note that this holds for any $n \geq n_0(\omega_0)$. So we can deduce from (38) that there are $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$ such that, uniformly in l,

$$|F_l(\tilde{z}) - F_l(z)| \leq C|\tilde{z} - z|^\alpha \tag{39}$$

when $|\tilde{z} - a_j| = r_j, r_1 - \epsilon_0 \leq |z - a_j| \leq r_j + \epsilon_0$ and $|z - \tilde{z}| \leq \epsilon_0$. In fact, we may take $\alpha = \tilde{c}/\log(1/r)$. This implies that the family $\{F_l\}$ is equicontinous on $\partial\Omega = \cup_{j=1}^m \partial U_j$. Hence we obtain that $\{F_l\}$ is equicontinous on $\mathbb{S}^2$. Thus applying Arzela-Ascoli's theorem and passing to a limit, we obtain a $W^{1,1}$-homeomorphic solution $F(z) = \lim_{l\to\infty} F_l(z)$ to the Beltrami equation (33).

Finally, we get from (39) that $F : \partial U_j \to \mathbb{C}$ is α-Hölder continuous for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. Note that F is analytic in $U_j, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, and satisfies (36). So we conclude that F is α-Hölder continuous on the components $\bar{U}_j$ of $\mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \Omega$. This completes the proof. □

Theorem 2 *Let Ω be an m-connected domain of the Riemann sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$ whose complement is a union of disjoint closed disks $\bar{U}_j, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$ for each fixed integer $m \geq 2$, and suppose that $\psi_j = \psi_{\omega,j} : \partial U_j \to \partial U_j$ is the random homeomorphism on the boundary component ∂U_j of Ω for $0 < \beta_j < \sqrt{2}$, with the exponential GFF as its derivatives, which is defined in Section 3.2. Then almost surely in ω, there exist random conformal mappings $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{S}^2$ and $g_j : U_j \to \mathbb{S}^2$, respectively, such that their boundary values satisfy (2), which produce m mutually disjoint random Jordan curves $\Gamma_j = \Gamma_{\omega,j} = f(\partial U_j) = g_j(\partial U_j)$, $j = 1, \cdots, m$, depending on $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_m)$. Moreover, almost surely in ω, these Jordan curves Γ_j are unique, up to composing with a Möbius transformation $\chi = \chi_\omega$ of the Riemann sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$.*

Proof. We first extend $(\psi_1, \psi_2, \ldots, \psi_m)$ to a homeomorphism $\Phi : \Omega \to \Omega$ as proceeded in Section 4.1 and define a complex dilatation $\lambda(z)$ corresponding to Φ by

$$\lambda(z) := \begin{cases} \partial_{\bar{z}}\Phi/\partial_z\Phi, & \text{if } z \in \Omega, \\ 0, & \text{if } z \in \bar{U}_j, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m. \end{cases}$$

Then Theorem 1 gives that there must be a homeomorphic solution F to the Beltrami equation (33). It is clear that F is conformal in U_j. Thus we put $g_j = F|_{U_j}$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. Next, notice that $K_F(z)$ is locally bounded in Ω. So by the uniqueness of the solution to the Beltrami equation we deduce that there exists a conformal homeomorphism f defined on Ω such that

$$F(z) = f \circ \Phi(z), \ z \in \Omega. \tag{40}$$

Since ∂U_j, $j = 1, \cdots, m$, are pairwise disjoint and F is homeomorphic on $\mathbb{C}$, we get that the image boundary

$$\partial f(\Omega) = \cup_{j=1}^m \partial f(U_j) = \cup_{j=1}^m \partial g(U_j) = F(\cup_{j=1}^m \partial U_j) \tag{41}$$

is a union of mutually disjoint Jordan curves Γ_j, where $\Gamma_j = f(\partial U_j) = g_j(\partial U_j)$. This implies that the conformal mappings f and g_j can be extended to $\partial\Omega = \cup_{j=1}^m \partial U_j$. Thus from (40) and the definitions of g_j and Φ, we deduce easily that f and g_j satisfy (2) on the boundary $\cup_{j=1}^m \partial U_j$ of Ω. Finally, it follows from Theorem 1 again that g_j is Hölder continuous on U_j. This, combined with Proposition 2, implies that the random welding curves Γ_j are unique up to composing with a Möbius transformation of $\mathbb{S}^2$. So we finish the proof of the theorem. □

Theorem 3 *Let Ω be an m-connected domain of the Riemann sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$ whose complement is a union of disjoint closed disks $\bar{U}_j, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$ for each fixed integer $m \geq 2$, and let $0 \leq \beta_j^+, \beta_j^- \leq \sqrt{2}$. Suppose that ψ_j^+ and ψ_j^- are two independent copies of the random homeomorphism of ∂U_j as defined in Section 3, associated with parameters β_j^+ and β_j^-, and two independent GFFs, respectively. Then, almost surely in ω, there exist random conformal mappings $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{S}^2$ and $g_j : U_j \to \mathbb{S}^2$, respectively, such that their boundary values satisfy*

$$f^{-1} \circ g_j = \psi_j^+ \circ (\psi_j^-)^{-1}, \tag{42}$$

which produce m mutually disjoint random Jordan curves $\Gamma_j = \Gamma_{\omega,j} = f(\partial U_j) = g_j(\partial U_j)$ depending on $(\beta_1^+, \ldots, \beta_m^+; \beta_1^-, \ldots, \beta_m^-)$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. Moreover, almost surely in ω, these Jordan curves Γ_j are unique, up to composing with a Möbius transformation $\chi = \chi_\omega$ of the Riemann sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$.

Proof. First, applying the same method as in Section 4.1, we extend the boundary homeomorphisms $\psi_1^+, \psi_2^+, \ldots, \psi_m^+$ to Ω and denote by Φ^+ the corresponding extension. Moreover, let λ^+ denote the dilatation of Φ^+ in Ω. Similarly, we may construct the Beurling-Ahlfors extensions of ψ_j^- to U_j, $j = 1, \cdots, m$, as in Section 4.1, and let Φ_j^- and λ_j^- stand for the associated extensions and dilatations respectively. Write

$$\lambda(z) = \begin{cases} \lambda^+(z), & \text{if } z \in \Omega, \\ \lambda_j^-, & \text{if } z \in \bar{U}_j, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m. \end{cases}$$

From the specific construction of these extensions and the condition (17), it is easy to see that λ has a compact support in $\mathbb{C}$. Since the estimates for the Lehto integral of the distortion function

$$K(z) = \frac{1 + |\lambda|}{1 - |\lambda|}$$

in the current situation are equal to those presented in Proposition 1, carrying through the same proof as the one of Theorem 1 with only notational changes we can find as before a solution to the Beltrami equation

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial \bar{z}}(z) = \lambda(z) \frac{\partial F}{\partial z}(z)$$

for almost every $z \in \mathbb{C}$, which satisfies the normalization (36). At the same time, $F|_{\partial U_j}$ is Hölder continuous for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$.

Next, due to the uniqueness of the solution to the Beltrami equation, there exist conformal mappings $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{S}^2$ and $g_j : U_j \to \mathbb{S}^2$ such that

$$F(z) = f \circ \Phi^+(z), \ z \in \Omega \tag{43}$$

and

$$F(z) = g_j \circ \Phi_j^-(z), \ z \in U_j \tag{44}$$

for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. Hence, arguing as in Theorem 1 we obtain m mutually disjoint random Jordan curves $\Gamma_j = \Gamma_{\omega,j} = f(\partial U_j) = g_j(\partial U_j)$ which depend on $(\beta_1^+, \ldots, \beta_m^+; \beta_1^-, \ldots, \beta_m^-)$. In the same manner, from (43) and (44) we deduce that f and g_j satisfy (42) on $\partial U_j, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, which shows that the mappings f and g_j solve the stated welding problem.

Finally, note that $F|_{\partial U_j}$ and $(\psi_j^-)^{-1}$ are Hölder continuous, which implies $g_j|_{\partial U_j}$, $j = 1, \cdots, m$, are Hölder continuous, too. So we deduce from Proposition 2 that Γ_j , $j = 1, \cdots, m$, are unique up a Möbius transformation $\chi = \chi_\omega$ of the Riemann sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$. This completes the proof of the theorem. □

References

[1] K. Astala, T. Iwaniec and G., Martin, Elliptic partial differential equations and quasiconformal mappings in the plane, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2009.

[2] K. Astala, P. Jones, A. Kupiainen and E. Saksman, Random conformal weldings, Acta Math., 207(2011), 203-254.

[3] A. Beurling and L. Ahlfors, The boundary correspondence under quasiconformal mappings, Acta Math., 96(1956), 125-142.

[4] C. J. Bishop, Conformal welding and Koebe's theorem, Ann. of Math., 166(2007), 613-656.

[5] F. Camia and C. M. Newman. Critical Percolation Exploration Path and SLE_6: a Proof of Convergence. Prob. Theor. Related Fields., 139 (2007), 473-519.

[6] B. Doyon, Factorisation of conformal maps on finitely connected domains, Preprint, 2011. arXiv:1107.0582v1[math.cv].

[7] F. P. Gardiner and N. Lakic, Quasiconformal Teichmüller Theory, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, Vol. 76, American Mathematical Society, 2000.

[8] D. H. Hamilton, Conformal welding, in The Handbook of Geometric Function Theory, North Holland, 2002.

[9] P. W. Jones and S. K. Smirnov, Removability theorems for Sobolev functions and quasiconformal maps, Ark. Mat., 38(2000), 263-279.

[10] W. Kager and B. Nienhuis, A guide to stochastic Löwner evolution and its applications, J. Stat. Phy., 115(2004), 1149-1229.

[11] G. F. Lawler, Conformal invariant processes in the plane, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2005.

[12] G. F. Lawler, O. Schramm and W. Werner, Confromal invariance of plannar loop-erased random walks and uniform spanning trees, Ann. Probab., 32 (2004), 939-995.

[13] G. F. Lawler and S. Sheffield, A natural parametrization for the Schramm-Loewner evolution, Annals of Probab. 39 (2011), 1896-1937.

[14] G. F. Lawler and W. Zhou, SLE curves and natural parametrization, Annals of Probab. 41 (2013) 1556-1584.

[15] O. Lehto, Homeomorphisms with a given dilatation, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 118 (1970), 58-73.

[16] O. Lehto and K. I. Virtanen, Quasiconformal mappings in the plane, second ed., Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1973.

[17] D. E. Marshall, Conformal welding for finitely connected regions, Comput. Methods and Funct. Theory, 11(2011), 655-669.

[18] D. Radnell and E. Schippers, Quasisymmetric sewing in rigged Teichmüller space, Commun. Contemp. Math., 8(2006), 481-534.

[19] S. Rohde and O. Schramm, Basic properties of SLE, Ann. of Math., 161(2005), 883-924.

[20] O. Schramm, Scaling limits of loop-erased random walks and uniform spanning trees, Israel J. Math., 118(2000), 221-288.

[21] O. Schramm and S. Sheffield, The harmonic explorer and its convergence to SLE(4), Ann. Probab., 33(2006), 2127-2148.

[22] O. Schramm and S. Sheffield, Contour lines of the two-dimensional discrete Gaussian free field, Acta Math., 202(2009), 21-137.

[23] S. Sheffield, Gaussian free fields for mathematicians, Probab. Theory Related Fields, 139(2007), 521-541.

[24] S. Sheffield, Conformal weldings of random surfaces: SLE and the quantum gravity zipper, Preprint, 2010. arXiv:1012.4797[math.pr].

[25] S. Smirnov, Critical percolation in the plane: conformal invariance, Cardy's formula, scaling limits, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math., 333(2001a), 239-244.

[26] S. Smirnov, Critical percolation in the plane. I. Conformal invariance and Cardy's formula. II. Continuum scaling limit. (long version of [25]). (2001b). arXiv:0909.4499

[27] S. Smirnov, Conformal invariance in random cluster models. I. Holomorphic fermions in the Ising model, Ann. of Math., 172(2010), 1435-1467.

[28] Nicalae Tecu, Random conformal weldings at criticality, Preprint, 2012. arXiv:1205.3189v1[math.cv].

[29] G. B. Williams, Discrete conformal welding, Indiana Univ. Math. J., 53(2004), 765-804.